DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 025 24 EA 004 433

AUTHOR Templeton, Ian
TITLE Differentiated Staffing. Educational Management Review Series Number 9.
INSTITUTION Oregon Univ., Eugene. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 72
CONTRACT OEC-0-8-080353-3514
NOTE 12p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Bibliographies; *Differentiated Staffs; Educational Innovation; *Literature Reviews; *Models; Organizational Change; School Organization; *Staff Utilization; Student Centered Curriculum; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This review surveys documents previously cited in RIE that deal with the concept, the accompanying controversy, programs in operation, and several models for implementation and evaluation. Also included are a discussion of the problems in adopting such organizational and role changes and a list of bibliographies on differentiated staffing. Thirty of the documents reviewed are available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. (Author)

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER • CLEARINGHOUSE ON EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT

EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT REVIEW SERIES

ED 069025

EA 004 433

—an ongoing survey of topics in educational management designed to provide the practicing educator with reviews that are contemporary and sensitive to education's changing information requirements. Most of the reports cited in the reviews have been processed by this and other clearinghouses in the ERIC system and announced in *Research in Education (RIE)*, ERIC's monthly index and abstract catalog.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Number 9 September 1972

Differentiated Staffing

Ian Templeton

American schools have been called the last of the cottage industries, in that most teachers are required to be jacks-of-all-trades and responsible for everything that goes on in the classroom. Regarding division of labor and specialization, elementary education has not really changed since the day of the little red school house.

Differentiated staffing permits the division of labor and specialization and, therefore, it holds the prospect of bringing the schools into the 20th Century along with business, law, medicine and other professions.

"Study Identifies" (1972)

A popular educational innovation of the last few years, the concept of differentiated staffing (DS) entails major school organizational changes and substantive redefinition of administrator and teacher roles. Redeployment of staff into roles other than the traditional assignments is usually associated with such innovations as team teaching, flexible-modular scheduling, elective programming, and the use of auxiliary personnel. Decentralization of instructional decisions and differentiation of positions and salaries in terms of responsibilities and expertise may also accompany DS. Such alterations in the conventional teaching-learning environment and in the role relationships of school staff stimulate examination of the processes, problems, solutions, and results involved.

From the extensive literature, this review surveys documents dealing with the concept, the accompanying controversy, programs in operation, and several models for implementation and evaluation. Also included are a discussion of the problems in adopting such organizational and role changes, and a list of bibliographies on differentiated staffing.

Of the documents reviewed, thirty are available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Complete instructions for ordering these are given at the end of the review.

THE CONCEPT

Because differentiating staff duties depends on local administrative options and available resources, priorities and criteria must be established on the local level. Allen and Kline (n.d.) find three questions facing the educator:

- What are we now doing in our school program, whether we recognize it or not, that makes use of different skills, responsibilities, and rewards?
- What responsibilities, established in other fields, could be worth initiating in education?
- What responsibilities or skills might be identified, generated, or created as education seeks new structures, new patterns, new roles, and even new purposes?

Use of clerks, proctors, and various paraprofessionals can significantly modify current staffing models. Elaboration of clerical services and expansion of team-teaching techniques are fundamental to staff differentiation. The authors also recommend the use of various optional student groupings as systematic and constructive teaching resources.

Teachers must learn and develop at a rate similar to that of their students if education is to keep up with social and technological change (Jordan 1967). For such mutual and cooperative change to occur, the educational staff must render diverse and wide-ranging services. The basic strategy essential to such services is the development of differentiated staffing patterns allowing school districts to meet needs in terms of available resources.

Jordan identifies two priority tasks required for differentiating the profession. First, all necessary information (especially role definitions and staffing pattern models) must be collected, organized, stored, and disseminated. Second, this information must be used to create a favorable climate for change. He also suggests reform of preservice and inservice education, reeducation of teacher educators, cooperation among educational agencies, and provision of financial and consultative assistance to project developers. Appendixes in Jordan's report list anticipated benefits of differentiated staffing structures, describe a DS pattern model, and identify problem areas needing priority attention.

Lynch and Handy (1970) focus on the premise that differentiated staffing requires more specialized teacher roles in the teaching and learning process. They discuss the press for specialization, the creation of new staff roles through differentiation, and the changes in school systems resulting from role differentiation. Their report includes examples of DS in three school districts, a DS model, and a transitional model.

A 1969 report by the National Education Association's National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards recommends the development of a

variety of model plans for differentiation of school staffs, and the full partnership of teachers and local education associations in designing, experimenting, evaluating, and implementing whatever successful techniques result. In addition to definitions of DS and evaluations to be employed in giving the concept an objective trial, the paper lists circumstances indicating that present roles of teachers and school personnel require further refinement.

The Central New York Regional Office for Educational Planning (1971) has compiled articles about differentiated staffing grouped into seven sections:

"Why Change?"

"A Consideration of Staffing Problems"

"Critics and Crusaders: An Analysis of Differentiated Staffing"

"Personnel Considerations"

"Restructuring the Training Sector and the Certification Problems"

"The Idea in Practice—Two Models"

"Proposals for Differentiated Staffing"

A reference materials section includes a full report on the Differentiated Staffing Conference held in 1969 at Geneva, New York, a brief listing of films and video tapes, definition of terms used in the document, and an extensive bibliography.

In a paper read before the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) annual convention, Keefe (1971) discusses the two models usually employed to describe differentiated staffing—horizontal and vertical. The J. Lloyd Trump (horizontal) differentiation assumes that the tasks, competencies, and responsibilities of teachers are different but equal; the Dwight Allen (vertical) differentiation assumes they are different and unequal. After discussing the general rewards and pitfalls of DS, Keefe concludes that, although the Trump and Allen models have served as the basis for all significant differentiated staffing proposals in the sixties, it is too soon for assessment of their ultimate success.

THE CONTROVERSY

Snyder (1971) outlines various arguments suggested by advocates of differentiated staffing for categorizing teaching duties according to different interests, abilities, and ambitions. As the outgrowth of such innovations as team teaching, nongraded programs, teacher aides, and open space planning, differentiated staffing makes maximum use of individual skills and talents of teachers. By eliminating the burden of subprofessional work and basing salary schedules on degrees of responsibility, DS promotes professional development and increases teacher expertise.

Allen and Kline (n.d.) point out that, traditionally, a teacher has performed several roles in addition to his instructional functions, including such duties as those of a part-time bookkeeper, clerk, and psychologist. Nevertheless, his salary scale is based primarily on length of service. According to these authors, differentiated staffing offers ways to change this pattern.

In a recent position paper, Bhaerman (1971) details the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) opposition to vertical staffing patterns that create salary differentials based on different "levels" of responsibility and thus foster disunity among teachers. He supports, instead, horizontally differentiated roles and responsibilities basing extra pay on the union principle of extra pay for extra work (for instance, supervision of interns or committee work).

Bhaerman cites two examples of differentiated staffing programs that support his position. The first program calls for the creation of a wide range of positions, from paraprofessional to adjunct professor. The second involves a horizontally differentiated staff including clerical teacher aides, teacher interns, assistant teachers, and team leaders.

TEMPLE CITY AND OTHER PLANS

A report of the Temple City, California, differentiated staffing project, edited by Stover (1969), contains several articles describing progress made in the first three years. The major article traces the history and development of the project, outlines its financial plan and schedule through 1972, and describes several characteristics of the model. These characteristics include self-regulation of the teaching profession through teacher participation in evaluation and in the formulation of academic policies; new roles for principals as "social managers" and chairmen of the academic senates; in-service training programs offering instructional management studies, behavioral study of organizations, and instruction in model building and human relations for senior and master teachers; microteaching experiences for staff teachers; auxiliary training for paraprofessionals; and evaluation training for all.

Other articles describe staff responsibilities, training, salary, and tenure plans; identify the composition and function of the project steering committee; and outline the program's flexible scheduling plan.

Stressing the adaptability of the Temple City plan to existing school systems, English (1969) presents and describes the model based on a hierarchy of differentiated teaching responsibilities rather than on a hierarchy of learning. The areas of responsibility designated by the plan include:

- instructional management, which features an advanced teacher as a learning engineer
- curriculum construction, which adds to a teacher's responsibilities
- emerging curricular theory and design by discipline structure
- advanced skills in the practical application of research for the improvement of instruction

English points out that this model decentralizes decision-making, creates more autonomous teacher roles that provide for individual differences among students and teachers, and establishes new career patterns and incentives for teachers according to their individual talents and development.

In a further discussion of the Temple City program, English (1970) provides a detailed model for the development of a differentiated staffing program that can continue to be modified. The history and organization of the project is set out in detail. One unique concept is the school academic senate, the policy-making body in the school directly responsible to the superintendent, which is neither elected nor appointed but is a selected group of teachers fulfilling an aspect of their differentiated responsibilities. An instruction council, responsible for curriculum development, is composed of master teachers in the various disciplines, the directors of education, and the superintendent. The roles and responsibilities of the various staff members are described in detail and include associate, senior, and master teachers, and paraprofessionals. The concept of promotion in a differentiated staffing program is examined, as well as selection and evaluation of personnel.

Stocker (1970) includes profiles of three school districts that have initiated differentiated staffing: Temple City, California; Cherry Creek, Colorado; and Kansas City, Missouri. He gives points of view of supporters and opponents, outlines some of the more common pitfalls and misunderstandings, and stresses the need for the full participation of all the teaching staff in the program design. A list of twenty-eight school districts throughout the country gives brief descriptions of other DS programs in the planning stage or already functioning.

Arends and Essig (1972) authored a series of five progress reports discussing the background, theory, and progress of the Differentiated Staffing Project being carried out in five Eugene, Oregon, elementary schools. The areas covered in the series are structure and staffing, organizational training, leadership, paraprofessionals, and instruction.

An Ohio Education Association (1971) booklet contains definitions of DS terms, the executive teacher plan, some new teacher models, a position statement on the concept, a process approach to model development, and information on administrating the differentiated staff. Staff plans for five schools are described: Temple City, California; Beaverton, Oregon; Mentor, Ohio; Warren, Ohio; and Princeton, Ohio.

Implementation and Evaluation Models

English and Zaharis (1970) outline the functional requirements for developing differentiated staffs. Designed to stimulate a search for new alternatives to staff organization, the document considers the various kinds of organization and staffing patterns needed in the client-centered school system, and the relationship of work specialization to instructional improvement.

A dissertation by Sharpes (1969) develops a model of differentiated teaching personnel based on student learning needs and designed to provide effective interaction between teaching style and student learning while providing the opportunity for growth and advancement that encourages teaching personnel to remain in the profession. The model differentiates secondary school staffing responsibilities as:

- general phases of a total school program—instruction, curriculum, facilities, testing, teacher evaluation, and responsibilities for students
- types or modes of learning-management activities under each phase—for example, large-group, small-group, or individually directed learning under the instructional phase
- level of responsibility in each activity—major, subordinate, or planning

Four submodels developed to define teaching responsibilities for each of four kinds of teachers—assistant, associate, senior, and master—illustrate applications of the model to staff utilization problems.

Reporting on a study of teacher roles in an individualized instructional system for Dade County (Florida) schools, Augenstein (1968) describes four major trends drawn from a survey of literature, research, and projected strategies:

- a shift from emphasis on the teacher as a presenter of information to an expeditor of learning conditions
- a greater emphasis on the preactive phase of teaching, during which the teacher must work with superiors, peers, and many sources of data to diagnose the child's needs skillfully and to prescribe expertly for his progress
- the challenge, during the interactive phase of teaching, of matching the teaching

style (factors of influence, management, relatedness, tone, and operational level) to the learning style of the pupil and to the learning activity at hand

- the teacher's growing role in the evaluative phase of teaching, in which the teacher's style must induce objective interpretation of the system as a whole and of his part in it

Products of the study include a set of operational definitions, a theoretical model for individual instructional staff assessment (teacher characteristics and behavior profiles), a man-machine model of instructional behavior, and a teaching-style classification scale for use in producing teaching-style profiles. The models and scale are included, plus discussion of implications for staff development and organization.

In 1969 Merrill proposed that a teaching team should consist of a horizontally differentiated staff with team members trained in four distinct skill areas: instructional design, instructional interaction, interpersonal design, and interpersonal interaction.

In a more recent paper (1971), he additionally proposes a vertically differentiated staff for instructional design. There would be three levels:

1. *instructional technicians* (teacher level), with teachers trained to use instructional design guides and challenged to plan effective instructional environments utilizing the materials available
2. *instructional technologists* (engineering level), with M.A.'s or specialist-level technologists trained to develop self-contained instructional systems: multimedia presentations, programmed materials, computer-assisted instruction, and instructional design guides for teachers to prepare their own instructional materials
3. *instructional psychologists* (scientist level), with Ph.D.'s trained to specify and develop instructional theory and to conduct laboratory behavioral science research on principles of instruction

Pillot (1970) reports on a conceptual design for a staff differentiation model divided into staffing and implementation submodels. The design enables school system leaders to provide component schools with the means for implementing a staff differentiation model designed for the individual school. The staffing submodel organizes the instructional staff into a logical vertical and horizontal differentiation. The five vertical levels of professional personnel are consulting teacher, directing teacher, staff teacher, instructor, and resident intern, assisted by paraprofessional personnel including instructional assistants, aides, student assistants, lay adjunct teachers, and volunteer assistants. The horizontal differentiation has four broad functional areas: instruction, staff development, administration, and planning-research-evaluation-reporting. The implementation includes a process for the allocation of total staff units to each school; the division of all schools into seven classifications according to size and type; an assignment of unit values to each position in the vertical hierarchy of the staffing submodel; a procedure for determining the approximate recommended number of jobs in each classification needed at a particular school; a set of job specification charts for each staff member; and the general performance criteria for staff accountability.

Innovations in school staffing arrangements sometimes go beyond recognized models, making it difficult to compare and evaluate such arrangements. A paper by DeBloois and Sharpes (1971) reports a model that describes aspects of staff utilization according to variables universal to all

school staffing procedures. Individualism, collegiality, professionalism, workflow structures, perpetuation structures, systems self-renewal, and accountability are the variables that constitute a staffing structure. Since each variable is a continuum and relatively independent from the others, a school staff may be characterized as having developed to a certain degree along a continuum for any variable. It is then theoretically possible to provide comparative measures among a variety of staffing innovations, to obtain pre- and postinnovation measures in a single school, and to obtain growth measures for one or more variables.

Three documents from the Leadership Training Institute for School Personnel Utilization (Massachusetts University 1970 a, b, c) deal with simulation exercises pertaining to differentiated staffing. The first simulates the planning of inservice training for implementing differentiated staffing. The second simulates the planning of an instructional program for the second week of the sixth grade in an elementary school. And the third simulates the planning of a differentiated staffing prospectus for a high school.

English and others (1970) discuss the Arizona-Mesa Differentiated Staffing Project's evaluation of the effects of the changes resulting from implementation of DS in three Mesa public schools. The authors report that experimental-design research in an ongoing social system was extremely difficult because of inability to control internal and external variables. The project staff identified factors jeopardizing internal and external validity and outlined tentative research designs for five areas. Project and nonproject schools were compared in student achievement, school climate, staff attitudes, teacher ability to perform tasks specified in the original proposal, and degree of actual staff differentiation. Each research design specifies a hypothesis, data-gathering instruments, dependent and independent variables, and statistical treatment.

Problems in Adopting Differentiated Staffing

Charters and Pellegrin (1972) present preliminary findings of four case studies of the implementation of differentiated staffing. The report outlines the principle of DS, explains the case studies, and presents the characteristic course of events during the preparation-formulation and the implementation phases.

Some of the general themes concerning the implementation of educational change are enumerated in a section entitled "Chronic Problems of the Change Process":

> - The gross unclarity in conceptualization and definition of what the schools are attempting to implement through change projects
> - The heavy reliance on structural change (writing job descriptions, changing titles, altering organizational units) in the belief that appropriate behavior changes will automatically follow
> - The fallacious assumption that a statement of general, abstract program values and objectives will easily be translated into new and appropriate behavior patterns at work
> - The apparent assumption that schools need little additional resources (financial or personnel) to cope with the massive organizational disruptions during the period of transition from one educational program form to a new one (pp. 17-19)

The concluding section, "Innovations: Imported or Invented?," notes that the

schools studied did not "import" a concrete differentiation model, but were encouraged to invent one. Because the programs were still being defined when implementation began, there are no criteria against which to measure the success or failure of the implementation.

The report warns:

> Researchers and others are in danger of being trapped by the language of an analytical model if they apply it to a situation where an innovation is essentially invented within the school. It may distract their attention from significant aspects of the change process: the value conflicts, political struggles, and negotiations that arise over what the innovation is to be during the formulation phase and the subsequent disagreements or private interpretations of it as people set about to implement it. (p. 21)

LITERATURE AND RESOURCES

McKenna (1969) has compiled a thirty-one item selected, annotated bibliography dealing directly with differentiation of school staffs.

A review by Piele (1970) analyzes the trend toward differentiation of secondary school instructional staffs to include teacher aides, technical assistants, clerical assistants, and staff specialists in addition to professional teachers.

The Marin County Superintendent of Schools (1970) presents a sixty-two item annotated bibliography of selected literature focusing on staff differentiation.

Ross (1969) provides a guide to 114 documents on differentiated staffing. *RIE* abstracts for the documents are included in an annotated bibliography.

Reporting on the Leadership Training Institute for School Personnel Utilization (LTI-SPU), Allen (1970) describes services available from LTI-SPU. A second article contains an annotated bibliography of basic references on differentiated staffing, a bibliography of all materials available at the SPU Resource Center, information on ordering bibliography entries, and a list of 1970-71 USOE-funded school personnel utilization projects.

A pamphlet by Cunningham (1969) surveys research and literature concerned with DS, paraprofessional school personnel, in-service education, team teaching, teacher selection, interaction analysis, and teacher certification. Extensive bibliographies are presented for each topic.

A Canadian Teachers' Federation (1970) bibliography is concerned principally with professional staff. It contains 113 citations with publication dates ranging from 1965 through 1970.

Stevens's bibliography presents a comprehensive listing of sources of information on differentiated staffing, nongraded-continuous progress learning, and open-concept schools.

REFERENCES

Abstracts of the following documents can be located in *Research in Education*. The complete texts are available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), commercial channels, or both. Publications can be ordered in either facsimile paper copy form or microfiche.

For each order, indicate the ED numbers of the desired publications, the type of reproduction desired (paper or microfiche), and the number of copies being ordered.

Payment must accompany orders under $10.00. Postage, at book rate or library rate, is included in the price of the document. If first class mailing is desired or if shipment is outside the continental United States, the difference between book rate or library rate and first class or foreign postage will be billed at cost. All orders must be in writing.

Address requests to ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Drawer O, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

Allen, Dwight W. *[Reports of the Leadership Training Institute for School Personnel Utilization.]* Amherst, Massachusetts: School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1970. 58 pages. ED 050 020 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

Allen, Dwight W., and Kline, Lloyd W. *Differentiated Staffing.* n.d. 32 pages. ED 051 119 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

American Association of School Administrators *ERIC Abstracts: A Collection of ERIC Document Resumes on Differentiated Staffing. ERIC Abstracts Series Number Nineteen.* Washington, D.C.: 1971. 34 pages. ED 048 673 MF $0.65 HC $3.29. (Also available from American Association of School Administrators, 1201 Sixteenth Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036, $2.00.)

Arends, Richard I., and Essig, Don M. *"Unitized Structure and Differentiated Staffing in the Elementary School." DSP Progress Report No. 1: Structure and Staffing.* Eugene, Oregon: Eugene School District 4, 1972. 28 pages. ED 060 511 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

———. *"Organizational Development Training in the Unitized, Differentiated Staffing, Elementary School." DSP Progress Report No. 2: Organizational Training.* Eugene, Oregon: Eugene School District 4, 1972. 19 pages. ED 060 512 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

———. *"The Role of the Principal and Curriculum Associate in the Unitized, Differentiated Staffing, Elementary School." DSP Progress Report No. 3: Leadership.* Eugene, Oregon: Eugene School District 4, 1972. 22 pages. ED 060 513 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

———. *"The Role of the Teaching Assistant in the Unitized, Differentiated Staffing, Elementary School." DSP Progress Report No. 4: Paraprofessionals.* Eugene, Oregon: Eugene School District 4, 1972. 19 pages. ED 060 514 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

———. *"Instructional Change in the Unitized, Differentiated Staffing, Elementary School." DSP Progress Report No. 5: Instruction.* Eugene, Oregon: Eugene School District 4, 1972. 20 pages. ED 060 515 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

Augenstein, Mildred B. *Style Is the Teacher. A Report of the Teacher Characteristics Project, 1967-68.* Miami, Florida: Dade County Public Schools, 1968. 25 pages. ED 032 278 MF $0.65 HC not available from EDRS.

Bhaerman, Robert D. *American Federation of Teachers' Statement on Vertical Staffing.* Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, 1971. 7 pages. ED 053 072 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

Canadian Teachers' Federation. *Differentiated Staffing. Bibliographies in Education, No. 15.* Ottawa, Ontario: 1970. 12 pages. ED 045 608 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

Central New York Regional Office for Educational Planning. *Differentiated Staffing.* Syracuse, New York: 1971. 627 pages. ED 061 156 MF $0.65 HC $23.03.

Charters, W. W., Jr., and Pellegrin, Roland J. *Differentiated Staffing Progress Report.* Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1972. 21 pages. (Available from CASEA, Publications Department, 1472 Kincaid, Eugene, Oregon 97401, free.)

Cunningham, Myron A. *Project Ideals; Staff Selection, Education and Utilization (Area H).* Gainesville, Florida: Florida Educational Research and Development Council, 1969. 100 pages. ED 050 439 Document not available from EDRS. (Available from J. B. White, Executive Secretary, Florida Educational Research and Development Council, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32601, $2.00.)

DeBloois, Michael, and Sharpes, Donald. "A Conceptual Model of School Personnel Utilization: A Developmental Spectrum for Evaluation Purposes."

To gather the documents in this review, *Research in Education* monthly catalogs were searched from January 1968 through July 1972, using as search terms these descriptors: Differentiated Staffing and Staff Utilization.

Paper presented at American Educational Research Association annual meeting, New York, February 1971. 55 pages. ED 047 368 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

English, Fenwick W. *Et Tu, Educator, Differentiated Staffing? Rationale and Model for a Differentiated Teaching Staff. TEPS Write-In Papers on Flexible Staffing Patterns, Number 4.* Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, 1969. 24 pages. ED 033 896 MF $0.65 HC not available from EDRS. (Available from Publications-Sales Section, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036, No. 521-15644, free.)

———. *A Handbook of the Temple City Differentiated Staffing Project. An Up-to-Date Revision of Project Procedures and Policies.* Temple City, California: Temple City Unified School District, 1970. 48 pages. ED 052 144 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

English, Fenwick W., and Zaharis, James. *How to Build a Model of Staff Differentiation. A Step by Step Guide in the Development of a Situational Specific Site Model of Differentiated Staffing.* Claremont, California: Claremont Graduate School, 1970. 42 pages. ED 051 120 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

English, Fenwick W., and others. *Evaluating the Effects of Implementing a Differentiated Teaching Staff: Problems and Issues. A Tentative Position Paper for Use in Project Evaluation.* Arizona: Mesa Public Schools, 1971. 20 pages. ED 056 993 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

Jordan, Daniel C. *Report on the Task Force Meeting on Task Analysis and Role Definition. (Indiana State University, October 1967).* Terre Haute: Indiana State University, 1967. 18 pages. ED 027 252 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

Keefe, James W. "Differentiated Staffing–Its Rewards and Pitfalls." Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Houston, Texas, January 1971. 7 pages. ED 048 635 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

Lynch, Patrick, and Handy, H. W. *Differentiated Staffing in Education.* Washington, D.C.: Administrative Leadership Service, Educational Service Bureau, Inc., 1970. 95 pages. ED 046 100 Document not available from EDRS. (Available from Administrative Leadership Service, Educational Service Bureau, Inc., 610 Madison Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314.)

Marin County Superintendent of Schools. *Staff Differentiation. An Annotated Bibliography.* San Rafael, California: 1970. 21 pages. ED 043 591 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

Massachusetts University. *Inservice Training Design Simulation.* Amherst, Massachusetts: School of Education, 1970. 16 pages. ED 051 091 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

———. *Instructional Planning Simulation.* Amherst, Massachusetts: School of Education, 1970. 37 pages. ED 051 092 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

———. *The School Planning Game. Description and Rules.* Amherst, Massachusetts: School of Education, 1970. 68 pages. ED 051 093 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

McKenna, Bernard. *A Selected Annotated Bibliography on Differentiated Staffing.* Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education; and National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, 1969. 16 pages. ED 033 898 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

Merrill, M. David. "Three Levels of Instructional Design." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association annual meeting, New York, 1971. 20 pages. ED 053 078 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

National Education Association. *A Position Statement on the Concept of Differentiated Staffing.* Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1969. 8 pages. ED 033 882 MF $0.65 HC not available

from EDRS. (Available from National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036, free.)

Ohio Education Association. *Interface on Learning: Differentiated Staffing.* Columbus, Ohio: [1971]. 136 pages. ED 060 449 MF $0.65 HC $6.58. (Also available from Printing and Mailing Division, Ohio Education Association, 225 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215. Single copies free to OEA member, others $1.00.)

Piele, Philip K. *New Sets of Jobs for School Personnel. Analysis of Literature and Selected Bibliography. Analysis and Bibliography Series, Number 3.* Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1970. 18 pages. ED 043 112 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

Pillot, Gene M. *A System Model of Differentiated Staffing. A Project Implemented at Pilot Schools under the Direction of the School Board of Sarasota County, Florida.* Sarasota, Florida: Sarasota County Board of Public Instruction, [1970]. 29 pages. ED 052 142 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

Ross, Marlene, comp. *Preparing School Personnel for Differentiated Staffing Patterns; A Guide to Selected Documents in the ERIC Collection, 1966-1968.* Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1969. 74 pages. ED 028 155 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

Sharpes, Donald K. *Differentiated Teaching Personnel: A Model for the Secondary School.* Doctoral Dissertation, Arizona State University, 1969. 144 pages. ED 035 614 MF $0.65 HC $6.58. (Also available from University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103.)

Snyder, Carey. "Why Not Differentiated Staffing?" A speech given before the annual convention of the National School Boards Association, Philadelphia, April 1971. 20 pages. ED 055 334 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

Stevens, Jody L. *Differentiated Staffing, Nongraded-Continuous Progress, Open Concept Schools. A Comprehensive Bibliography.* Houston, Texas: Bureau of Education Research and Services, University of Houston, 1972. 65 pages. ED number not yet assigned. (Also available from Bureau of Education Research and Services, College of Education, University of Houston, Cullen Boulevard, Houston, Texas 77004, $2.00.)

Stocker, Joseph. *Differentiated Staffing in Schools: A Review of Current Policies and Programs.* Washington, D.C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1970. 50 pages. ED 042 727 MF $0.65 HC not available from EDRS. (Available from National School Public Relations Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036, No. 411-12754, $4.00.)

Stover, Michael, ed. *The Temple City Story: New Careers in Teaching: Differentiated Staffing.* California: Temple City Unified School District, 1969. 12 pages. ED 029 853 MF $0.65 HC $3.29.

"Study Identifies Difficulties Met in Adoption of Differentiated Staffing," *R & D Perspectives,* (Spring 1972).

Previous Publications in This Series

1. **Computer Applications in Class and Transportation Scheduling, by Philip K. Piele. ED 057 436 MF $0.65 HC $3.29**
2. **Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems, by Philip K. Piele. ED 058 622 MF $0.65 HC $3.29**
3. ***School Financial Elections, by Philip K. Piele**
4. ***Flexible-Modular Scheduling, by Sharon Counts Johnson**
5. ***Principal's Role in Collective Negotiation, by Ian Templeton**
6. ***Year-Round Schools, by Sharon Counts Johnson**
7. ***Middle Schools, by Sharon Counts Johnson**
8. ***Class Size, by Ian Templeton**

***While the supply lasts, a free copy of each review may be obtained by writing to the Editor, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403**

RESEARCH HIGHLIGHTS

The AFT opposes vertical staffing patterns that create salary differentials based on different "levels" of responsibility and thus foster disunity among teachers. *(Bhaerman 1971)*

Because differential staffing eliminates the burden of subprofessional work and bases salary schedules on degrees of responsibility, it promotes professional development, and increases the responsibility and expertise of teachers. *(Snyder 1971)*

The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (NCTEPS) of the NEA recommends the development of a variety of model plans for differentiation of school staffs. *(National Education Association 1969)*

Clearinghouse Accession Number: EA 004 433

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the United States Office of Education. ERIC serves the educational community by disseminating educational research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of twenty such units in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its nineteen companion units process research reports and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in *Research in Education (RIE)*, available in many libraries and by subscription for $21 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Journal articles are announced in *Current Index to Journals in Education. CIJE* is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for $39 a year from CCM Information Corporation, 866 Third Avenue, Room 1126, New York, New York 10022.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse has another major function—information analysis and synthesis. The Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, state-of-the-knowledge papers, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its educational area.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management operates under contract with the Office of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This review was prepared pursuant to that contract. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403